



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

CH

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/538,767	03/30/2000	Yvonne Ng	1697 (USW 0562 PUS)	8838

22193 7590 09/10/2003

QWEST COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL INC  
LAW DEPT INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY GROUP  
1801 CALIFORNIA STREET, SUITE 3800  
DENVER, CO 80202

EXAMINER

LEE, SEUNG H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	2876

DATE MAILED: 09/10/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	09/538,767	NG, YVONNE
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Seung H Lee	2876

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 July 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                  2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,2,7-13 and 18-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,2,7-13 and 18-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some \* c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                               | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ . |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)           | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .                                   |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Receipt is acknowledged of the Amendment filed on 02 July 2003, which has been entered in the file.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 2, 11-13, and 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zancho et al. (US 5,633,484, of record)(hereinafter referred to as 'Zancho') in view of Detlef (US 6,178,403, of record).

Zancho teaches a plurality of remote appliances such as a cellular phone (101), a desk phone (111), a personal computer (121), a personal organizer (131), and a dashboard (141) in which each appliance have different setting such as a font, a menu order preferences, a location of icons, etc. serving as a local list and each appliances equipped with a card reader to read information/data from a portable donor device (105) such as a smart card, the donor device containing a processor and memory storing a particular user's preferences such as the font, the menu order preferences, the location of icons, etc. serving as a master list wherein the donor device can be carried by user in order to update/synchronize preferences with each local appliance when the donor device was inserted into the card reader, and then the local appliances is displaying the

updated/synchronized preferences on the display of local appliances thereon, the remote appliances including web-enabled appliances (e.g., a cellular phone and a personal computer) and non-web-enabled appliances (e.g., a desk phone and a dash board) (see Figs. 1-10; col. 1, lines 19-29; col. 2, line 31- col. 7, line 18).

However, Zancho fails to teach or fairly suggest that a memory is storing the personal data entries such as names, address, telephone numbers, etc.

Detlef teaches a personal data appliances such as an address book including details of address such as an address, a name, a telephone number, and an e-mail address (see Figs. 5 and 6; col. 3, lines 9-41).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Detlef to the teachings of Zancho in order to provide an improved and an enhanced means wherein users can transfer information/data from the smart card to the address book without entering each and every data field of address book such as the address, the name, etc. by inserting the smart card into the address book. Moreover, such modification would provide a convenience wherein users always can work with updated information/data by updating information/data to only the smart card, and therefore an obvious expedient.

4. Claims 7 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zancho in view of Detlef as applied to claim 1 and 11 above, and further in view of Hamann et al. (US 6,296,191, of record)(hereinafter referred to as 'Hamann').

The teachings of Zancho/Detlef have been discussed above.

Art Unit: 2876

Although, Zancho/Detlef teaches the smart card storing lists of information wherein the smart card is synchronizing with the local appliances such as personal organizer, etc., they fail to teach or fairly suggest that the list of information includes an electronic bookmark.

Hamann teaches a smart card (100) wherein the smart card contains a memory area storing lists of addresses of the Internet (220) (see Fig.2; col. 3, lines 41-48).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Hamann to the teachings of Zancho/Detlef in order to provide an convenience means wherein the users can access his/her favorite/bookmarked web site using any given web-enabled electronic device wherein bookmarked internet site are updated from the smart card. Moreover, such modification would provide an improved maintenance means wherein the users do not have to bookmark the particular website on each and every electronic device since user can retrieve the information/data from the smart card that contains all bookmark information, and therefore an obvious expedient.

5. Claims 8 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zancho in view of Detlef as applied to claim 1 and 11 above, and further in view of Teicher (US 5,744,787, of record).

The teachings of Zancho/Detlef have been discussed above.

Although, Zancho/Detlef teaches the smart card storing lists of information wherein the smart card is synchronizing with the local appliances such as personal

organizer, etc., they fail to teach or fairly suggest that the list of information includes an electronic wallet.

However, Teicher discloses that the smart card serving as an electronic wallet (see Figs. 2 and 4; col. 1, line 21 – 57; col. 9, line 46-54).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the conventional electronic wallet as taught by Teicher to the teachings of Zancho/Detlef in order to provide a easier and quicker transaction of purchase at the point of sale (POS) terminal, gas station, or the like. First of all, such modification would provide a constant acknowledgement of the value of electronic wallet every time the electronic funds are consumed by the customers (i.e., unlike the conventional/typical credit card which the customers have to wait until the monthly billing statement or to call the customer service center to verify the past transaction. Second, such modification would provide the easier replenishing the value of the electronic wallet by authorizing cash/money transfer from the bank account (i.e., the checking account, the credit card) to the smart card using ATM, telephone, Internet transaction, or the like, then the value of electronic wallet on the smart card will be replenished during the next authorization process. Third, such modification would provide an improved and an enhanced means operator(s) can obtain the transaction/transmission information constantly from display in which display the status information during the process. Finally, such modification would provide a convenient means wherein customer(s) can carry the electronic wallet within his/her wallet/purse without carrying particular storage unit, and therefore an obvious expedient.

6. Claims 9 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zancho in view of Detlef as applied to claim 1 and 11 above, and further in view of Taylor (US 5,578,808, of record).

The teachings of Zancho/Detlef have been discussed above.

Although, Zancho/Detlef teaches the smart card storing lists of information wherein the smart card is synchronizing with the local appliances such as personal organizer, etc., they fail to teach or fairly suggest that the list of information includes a password.

However, Taylor teaches the password (PIN) (see Fig. 1; col. 3, line 21 – 40).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the notoriously old and well known password as taught by Taylor to the teachings of Zancho/Detlef in order to provide a secure process of the accessing each application on the smart card by assigning each application with its own unique password. Also, such modification (assigning the password with its own application) would prevent accidental processing of a particular application, since each application password can be different from other application's password and only the application with correct assigned password can authorize the processing, and therefore an obvious expedient

Art Unit: 2876

7. Claims 10 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zancho in view of Detlef as applied to claim 1 and 11 above, and further in view of Chen et al. (US 5,694,471, of record)(hereinafter referred to as 'Chen').

The teachings of Zancho/Detlef have been discussed above.

Although, Zancho/Detlef teaches the smart card storing lists of information wherein the smart card is synchronizing with the local appliances such as personal organizer, etc., they fail to teach or fairly suggest that that the smart card having encrypted password to control access the master list.

Chen teaches the using encrypted password to access the application onto the smart card to access the application onto the smart card (420 – 450)(see Fig. 5; col. 2, line 9 – 39; col. 10, line 14 – 31).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the well known encrypted password as taught by Chen to the teachings of the Zancho/Detlef in order to provide an improved authentication process to access the master list within the smart card. Also, such modification would provide a secure synchronizing process by having the conventionally known encrypted password assigned to the smart card to be verified by the remote appliance to synchronize between the local list in the remote appliance and the master list on the smart card, therefore and an obvious expedient.

### ***Response to Arguments***

8. Applicant's arguments filed 02 July 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to the applicant's argument that "*Detlef does describe a distributed voice capture and recognition system. However, Detlef fails to suggest modifying Zancho to incorporate a master list of personal data entries...*" (see page 8, line 4+), The Examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant wherein Detlef teaches an improved credit card sized PDA that supports data acquisition function such as personal data (e.g., an address, a name, a telephone number, and an e-mail address) and synchronizing with a host system (see Figs. 9 and 10; col. 1, line 53- col. 3, line 12). Furthermore, Detlef 3, lines 9-41). Moreover, such captured voice data are related to the address book such as an address, a name, a telephone number, and an e-mail address as shown in Fig. 6. in which the data can be converted to the text-based representation (col. 4, lines 1-21). Therefore, given its broadest reasonable interpretation of this instant claimed invention, the combination of Zancho and Detlef meets the claimed limitation.

### ***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure;

Hawkins et al. [US 6,000,000] discloses a method and a system for synchronizing data between two system,

Tokuda et al. [US 5,313,211] discloses a detachable IC card to a portable data processing device,

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communication from the examiner should be directed to Seung H. Lee whose telephone number is (703) 308-5894. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 7:30 AM to 4:00 PM.

If attempt to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael G. Lee, can be reached on (703) 305-3503. The fax-phone number for this group is (703) 308-5841 or (703) 308-7722.

Communications via Internet e-mail regarding this application, other than those under 35 U.S.C. 132 or which otherwise require a signature, may be used by the applicant and should be addressed to [michael.lee@uspto.gov].

*All Internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the application file. PTO employees do not engage in Internet communications where there exists a possibility that sensitive information could be identified or exchanged unless the record includes a properly signed express waiver of the confidentiality requirements of 35 U.S.C. 122. This is more clearly set forth in the Interim Internet Usage Policy published in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark on February 25, 1997 at 1195 OG 89.*

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

*Seung H. Lee*  
Seung H. Lee  
Art Unit 2876  
August 25, 2003

*Diane I. Lee*

DIANE I. LEE  
PRIMARY EXAMINER